DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 161 AC 002 121

By- Alexander, Frank D.; Harshaw, Jean

IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF AGRICULTURAL AGENTS IN NEW YORK STATE: 1963. EXTENSION STUDY NUMBER 6.

State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. Coll. of Agriculture at Cornell.; State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. Coll. of Home Economics at Cornell Univ.

Pub Date Sep 64

Note- 74p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.04

Descriptors- *EXTENSION AGENTS, *INSERVICE EDUCATION, *MAN DAYS, ORIENTATION, *REFRESHER COURSES, RETRAINING, *RURAL EXTENSION, TECHNICAL EDUCATION, UNITS OF STUDY (SUBJECT FIELDS)

Identifiers- *New York State

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the nature and amount of inservice training which the 168 agricultural agents in New York State received during 1963. Emphasis was on refresher and other training. The greatest number of days of training offered agents was in November followed closely by March and February, in all, a total of 367 of the total days offered. In 1963 for the first time the Early Training School at Cornell for new assistant agents had three groups--third year, second year, and first year. Training was given entirely in July and constituted 307 of the total inservice training offered that year (45 man days). Two Induction Schools at Cornell for new assistant agents were held, one in April and the other in October and November, with 19 man days devoted to the two schools. Over twice as many days of technical compared to methodological subject-matter were offered, with farm management ranking first. The average number of days of training was 12.8, the mean attendance for the meetings being 16.5. Of the estimate total man days of work input for the agents, 5.67 was spent in refresher and other training. No attempt was made to evaluate the program. (eb)

A002121

Aug 68

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF AGRICULTURAL AGENTS IN NEW YORK STATE: 1963

Extension Study No. 6

Office of Extension Studies
New York Extension Service
State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics
Units of the State University
At Cornell University
Ithaca, New York
September, 1964

ED002121

A0002121

Authors: Frank D. Alexander, Administrative Specialist in Extension Studies, and Jean Harshaw, Statistical Clerk in Extension Studies--Cornell University.

PREFACE

This study of in-service training of Agricultural Agents in the New York Extension Service grew out of a concern of the In-service Training Committee for Agricultural Agents. The study is essentially a description of in-service training for the calendar year, 1963. It is hoped that this presentation of some of the salient features of a year's program of in-service training of agricultural agents will provide those responsible for planning the training a basis for evaluating their past efforts and for making decisions leading to an improved program.

The study was made possible through the efforts of specialists, state leaders, and county agricultural agents, who helped collect the data for the study.

A GIFT
Robert L. Bruce
THE LIBRARY OF
CONTINUING EDUCATION
AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary of Findings	1
Introduction	7
Purpose and Methodology	7
Time and Amount of Training Offered	9
Number of Days of Training Offered According to Subject-matter Areas	10
Number of Days of Training Received by Classes of Agents	19
Attendance and Length of Refresher and Other Training Meetings	21
Man Days of Training Received	21
Relationship of Training Received to Work In-put	31
Appendices A, B, C, D, E, and F	39

IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF AGRICULTURAL AGENTS IN NEW YORK STATE: 1963

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the nature and amount of in-service training which agricultural agents in New York State received during the calendar year 1963. The study includes the 168 agents employed in agricultural Extension work during the year. Emphasis in the study is on refresher and other training.[1]

Time and Amount of Training Offered

1. The greatest number of days of refresher and other training offered agricultural agents was in November followed closely by March and February. In these three months, or one fourth of the year, 36 per cent of the total days of refresher and other training was offered.

2. In 1963 for the first time the Early Training School at Cornell for new assistant agents had three different groups, i.e., agents in the third and last year of this type of training, agents in the second year, and those in the first or beginning year. This training was given entirely in July. The number of days (45.00) of this training constituted 30 per cent of the total in-service training (148.50 days) offered in 1963.

3. Two Induction Schools at Cornell for new assistant agents were held in 1963, one in April and the other the latter part of October and first part of November with 19.00 days devoted to the two schools.

4. Together induction and early training constituted 43 per cent of all days of training offered in 1963.

---

[1] While a large part of formal in-service training other than the induction and early training at Cornell for new assistant agricultural agents is refresher training, this term was not considered inclusive and hence "other training" was added to it.

Number of Days of Training Offered According to Subject-Matter Areas

1. Regional meetings of agents which could not be classified under any subject-matter area or areas with any degree of accuracy heads the list for number of days of refresher and other training offered. Other subject-matter offered for a week or (5 days plus) were farm management (8.00 days), home grounds (7.00 days), vegetables and potatoes (5.50 days) and farm structures (5.00 days). Rural sociology is in the lowest position with only one day.[1]

2. Over twice as many days of technical compared to methodological subject-matter were offered in refresher and other training in 1963.

3. Commercial florists or horticulture and home grounds ranked first and second in number of days of induction and early training offered new assistant agents in 1963.

4. Of the induction and early training offered in 1963, 112.50 days were in technical areas and 15.00 days in methodological subject-matter.

5. When all days of in-service training are considered, farm management ranks first followed closely by home grounds, commercial florists or horticulture, and vegetables and potatoes. Four methodological areas had the smallest number of days offered.

6. Days of technical offerings for all in-service training in 1963 were 4.7 times the number of days for methodological offerings.

7. For 14 of 20 areas of subject-matter, the relative emphasis (based on rank position) in offerings within refresher and other training and within induction and early training was not greatly different, although the actual number of days offered in the various areas as between the two types of training may have differed greatly.

---

[1] It should be noted that throughout the report some meetings or sessions and, therefore, days were classified under more than one subject-matter area. This overlapping occurs wherever the data are presented by areas of training.

Number of Days of Training Received by Classes of Agents

1. The average (median) number of actual days of refresher and other training received by all (168) agents in 1963 was 12.8. The averages for the various classes of agents were 15.5 days for the head agents, 12.3 for associate agents, 9.5 for assistant agents, and 7.4 for regional agents.

2. Only associate, regional, and assistant agents received induction and early training, and only a small number of the first two classes of agents received this type of training; but 82 per cent of the assistants received this kind of training.

3. The assistant agents were considerably ahead of all other classes of agents in average number of days of all in-service training. The average (median) for assistants was 24.9 days, for head agents 15.5, for associate agents 13.1, and for regional agents 8.0. For all agents the average was 15.3 days.

Attendance and Length of Refresher and Other Training Meetings[1]

1. The mean registered attendance for the 102 refresher and other training meetings held in 1963 was 16.5 and the median was 15.4. The range in attendance was great, from two to 131.

2. Seventy-eight per cent of the refresher and other training meetings were one day in length.

Man Days of Training Received

1. Of the estimate total man days of work in-put, for the 168 agents in 1963, 5.6 per cent was spent in refresher and other training and 1.8 per cent in induction and early training for a total of 7.4 per cent.

2. Farm management is considerably above any other subject-matter area in number of man days of refresher and other training with 563.50 man days.

---

[1] The data on induction and early training at Cornell did not lend themselves to a very meaningful analysis of this kind.

3. In terms of man days technical refresher and other training amounted to 2.7 times that received in methodological training of this type.

4. Farm management, commercial florists or horticulture, home grounds, vegetables and potatoes, farm forage crops, and fruit in that order are the subject-matter areas which had the largest number of man days of induction and early training.

5. Man days of technical training received in induction and early training was 6.9 times those received in methodology.

6. Farm management was considerably in the lead in total man days of in-service training.

7. All technical subject-matter man days of training was 3.6 times those for methodology.

8. For 11 of 20 areas of subject-matter when compared in terms of rank order the relative emphasis within refresher and other training and within induction and early training is not greatly different (a difference of three rank points or less) but for the remaining nine the difference ranged from four to 16 rank points.

Relation of Training Received to Work In-put

1. For seven of the 13 work areas for which data on work in-put were available, there is relatively little refresher and other training taken by agents who did no work in these areas. These seven areas are commercial florists or horticulture, farm structures, fruit, home grounds, livestock, poultry, and vegetables and potatoes.

2. Farm forage crops, farm management, and resource development have rather high percentages of agents who did no work in these areas but had some training. The broad application of information from the first two areas and the newly developed concern in the third may account for this.

3. Twelve of the 13 work areas had 52.4 per cent or more of those agents working from 0.1 to 20.0 days in these areas who had no training therein.

4. In general, there is a positive relationship between amount of work in-put and amount of refresher and other training received.

5. In general, it seems that induction and early training is less positively related to the actual work of the agent than is refresher and other training.

Relevant Questions

This study was designed primarily to describe the in-service training program of agricultural agents in one calendar year; therefore, no attempt has been made to evaluate the program. It was felt, however, that a number of questions relating to the description should be listed for the consideration of those concerned with in-service training. The questions which appear to be relevant are:

1. Are the times of year when training is offered best suited to the work load of the trainees?

2. Is there a proper balance between the offerings in refresher and other training and in induction and early training?

3. Are the amounts of training offered in various subject-matter areas properly adjusted to the various aspects of the agricultural program and, therefore, to the competency needs of agents?

4. Is there a proper balance between training offered in technical versus methodological subject-matter?

5. Is the amount of in-service training received by various classes of agents in proper balance?

6. In refresher and other training does attention need to be given to the number and length of training meetings?

7. Is the per cent of total man days of work devoted to in-service training adequate?

8. In terms of man days of training received are the various training areas doing the job which the varied emphases of the agricultural program require?

9. Does the relationship of training received to work in-put indicate an efficient use of training time?

10. Should in-service training that is not related to one's job requirement be decreased or increased?

11. Is the less positive relationship of induction and early training compared to refresher and early training a sound educational practice?

Introduction

This study was developed through discussions between the Agricultural State Leaders and the staff of the Office of Extension Studies. It actually grew out of an interest of the College Committee on In-service of Agricultural Agents in having a better picture of the program and in-put of in-service training in order to plan a more effective effort in this respect.

Purpose and Methodology

The purpose of the study was to ascertain the nature and amount of in-service training which agricultural agents received in a calendar year. An experimental trial was undertaken in 1962. Since the decision to initiate a study was not made until May 7, the trial study could only be conducted from the middle of May to the end of 1962.

A rather simple form was prepared for obtaining information regarding training meetings or conferences. The form called for: 1) name of meeting (or conference), 2) purpose, 3) person responsible, 4) date of meeting, 5) list of teachers or other resource people, 6) record of attendance including--a) names of agents, b) titles of agents, c) county in which working, and d) number of days and/or parts of days expected to attend. The person responsible for the meeting was asked to provide the information for items 1 to 5 and to circulate the form among those attending for each one to enter the information for item 6--a,b,c,d. (See Appendix A for form.)

When the trial study was initiated, training was defined to include both formal and informal meetings. An informal meeting was defined as a teaching situation involving two or more agents and a specialist. These informal training situations were believed to be rather extensive, and it was hoped that a record of them could be obtained. Only a few returns on informal meetings were ever obtained, so that this aspect of the study was dropped.

A letter explaining the study and the procedure to be followed in obtaining the information was prepared. This letter under the signatures of the State Leader of Agriculture and the leader of the Office of Extension Studies was sent to all specialists in the College of Agriculture. (See Appendix B for copy of letter.) Several copies of the form described above were enclosed. These forms were to be used by the specialists for reporting informal

meetings. Since the same form was to be used for formal meetings, the copies (or at least one of them) were also intended to acquaint the agent with the kind of instrument which the study would employ. The explanatory letter indicated that about a week before each formal meeting the specialist would be sent a form for that meeting. The Office of Extension Studies kept up with the dates of formal meetings through maintaining close contact with the Office of the State Leaders of Agriculture and through the monthly issues of Current Episodes, a New York Extension Service news leaflet, each issue of which contains a list of future training events.

A somewhat similar letter was sent to each of the Agricultural State Leaders. (See Appendix C for copy of letter.) Enclosed with the letter was one form to illustrate the directions in the letter. The State Leaders were not asked to report on informal teaching situations since their supervisory functions include this type of contact, and it would, therefore, have been practically impossible to report on these contacts.

Data from the reporting forms were transferred to one card for each individual agent. (See Appendix D for card.) The card provided for recording an accumulated record of the agent's attendance at training conferences. In addition, a master list of all training meetings was prepared. This master list contained the following items: 1) date of training meeting, 2) number of days devoted thereto, 3) name of meeting, 4) subject-matter areas applicable to (this was begun by using a list of agents' job assignment areas but was subsequently converted and expanded into a list of subject-matter areas), and 5) number attending. (See Appendix E for the list of training meetings for 1963.)

The trial experiment during the last two thirds of 1962 indicated that the system which had been set up seemed to work very well. Accordingly, the collection of records was continued throughout 1963. Preliminary tables containing some of the 1962 as well as the 1963 data were prepared and given limited circulation in the early part of 1964.[1] Since the 1962 data were for only a partial year,

---

[1] The preliminary tables for 1962 and 1963 were found to contain some errors, and subsequent analysis of the data has indicated the need for revision of those tables. While the general picture of in-service training provided by the preliminary tables was substantially accurate, those tables should be replaced by the data presented in this report.

this report is confined to the 1963 data.[1]

In describing the in-service training received by agents, it was considered desirable to relate the training received to the work areas of agents. To attain this objective the information on training received was first organized by assignment areas as reported by the State Leaders' Office. Since these reported assignments are not always adhered to over a period of time, it was decided that the agents' estimates of their time in-put according to areas of work as reported on their monthly report forms was required. Since this shift to agents' estimates of time in-put by areas of work was initiated after the training received had been categorized according to work assignment areas, it became necessary on the basis of efficiency in processing the data to convert the work areas on the agent's monthly report form to the assignment categories which had already been used for classifying the training. The conversion is described in detail later in the study where it serves to explain the manner in which data at that point are handled. To carry out this shift in relating training received to work areas, the annual time in-put by work areas was obtained from each county for each agent employed there in 1963.

Information from the master list, the individual agent's record card, and the individual agent's time in-put according to areas of work was placed on IBM cards. In addition some of the information was organized by means of hand tabulations.

Time and Amount of Training Offered

Since the In-service Training Committee has developed a new program of induction and early training for new assistant agents which has been underway for about four years, the more immediate concern of the committee is with refresher and other training for agents. For this reason first attention is given to this type of training in the various sections of the report.

The greatest number of days of refresher and other training offered agricultural agents was in November followed closely by

---

[1] Several revised tables on the 1962 data are available in the files of the Office of Extension Studies.

March and February (Table 1).[1] In these three months, or one fourth of the year, 36 per cent of the total days of refresher and other training was offered.

In 1963, for the first time, the Early Training School at Cornell for new assistant agents had three different groups, i.e., agents who were in the third and last year of this type of training, agents in the second year, and those in the first or beginning year. Since this early training was offering different subject-matter to each of three different groups of agents, the 15 days of training for each group was multiplied by three and entered in Table 1 as 45 days of training. This early training for new assistant agents constituted a sizeable percentage (30) of the total in-service training (148.50 days) which was offered agents in 1963.

Two Induction Schools at Cornell for new assistant agents were held in 1963. The number of days devoted to these training schools was 19.00. Altogether induction and early training for new assistant agents amounted to 64.00 days, or 43 per cent of all days of training (148.50) offered all agents in 1963.

If the monthly distribution of total days of training is examined, July is by far the outstanding month with 48.00 days. This large amount of total training in July is almost entirely the result of early training for new assistant agents. April and November are also months in which total days of training are relatively large. In these months induction training of new assistants had considerable influence on the total amount of training given.

Number of Days of Training Offered According to Subject-matter Areas[2]

Before examination is made of the data presented in Table 2, it should be emphasized that there are no established criteria for

---

[1] While a large part of formal in-service training other than the induction and early training at Cornell for new assistant agricultural agents is refresher training, this term was not considered inclusive and hence "other training" was added to it.

[2] Subject-matter areas in this section and the two following sections were determined in the first instance by the standard assignment areas (designated by center heads) for agents as outlined by the State Leaders of Agriculture. A broad miscellaneous category of training remained after using the assignment areas. This miscellanous category was then broken into sub-classes. These sub-classes plus the assignment areas with some limited combinations of the latter constitute the subject-matter areas which appear in the tables of this and the following two sections.

Table 1.- Number of Days of Training Offered According to Months, by Types of Training: 1963.

Month	Refresher and other training		Induction & early training at Cornell		Total	
	No. of days[a]	Per cent	No. of days	Per cent	No. of days	Per cent
January	5.00	6			5.00	3
February	9.50	11			9.50	6
March	10.00	12			10.00	7
April	8.00	10	9.50[b]	15	17.50	12
May	8.00	10			8.00	5
June	8.00	10			8.00	5
July	3.00	3	45.00[c]	70	48.00	33
August	3.00	3			3.00	2
September	7.00	8			7.00	5
October	7.00	8	3.50[d]	5	10.50	7
November	11.00	13	6.00[d]	10	17.00	12
December	5.00	6			5.00	3
Total	84.50	100	64.00	100	148.50	100

[a] Refresher and other training meetings held in different places involving different agents in each place (usually regional meetings), dealing with the same subject-matter in each place, and utilizing the same amount of time are given credit for only the time devoted to the meeting in one place. Because some meetings such as those just described took place in two adjacent months, it was necessary to assign the time devoted to the subject-matter concerned in an arbitrary manner. The month in which the first meeting of a series was held was the month to which the time was assigned.

[b] Total time for an Induction School.

[c] Includes three simultaneous Early Training Schools of 15 days each (1-year, 2-year, and 3-year groups).

[d] An Induction School of 9.50 days extended from October 28 at noon through November 8. Three and one half days were assigned to October and 6.00 to November.

Table 2. Number of Days of Refresher and Other Training Offered, by Areas of Training: 1963.

Areas of training	Number of days offered [b]
Regional meetings of agents	13.50
Farm management	8.00
Home grounds	7.00
Vegetables and potatoes	5.50
Farm structures--dairy and poultry	5.00
Extension program development	4.50
Poultry	4.50
Resource development or conservation	4.50
Commercial florists or horticulture	4.00
Extension organization--orientation to	4.00
Farm forage crops	4.00
Dairy	3.50
Fruit	3.50
Livestock--beef, sheep, and swine	3.50
Communications including Extension news [a]	3.00
Marketing	3.00
Educational processes	2.00
Extension administration & supervision	2.00
Extension housekeeping	2.00
Public affairs	2.00
Rural sociology	1.00

[a] Subject matter concerned Extension news only.

[b] No total is given for these figures because some training meetings and, therefore, days were classified under more than one subject-matter area.

judging what the relative in-put according to subject-matter areas for refresher and other training of agricultural agents should be. Undoubtedly, the amount of training offered in various areas reflects the resources of departments, the importance which supervisors and administrators attach to the various areas, and finally the demands for information from the various types of farmers in the State. It is anticipated that study of the table will stimulate questions regarding the relative emphasis which is reflected in the data.

The areas of refresher and other training in Table 2 are in rank order according to the number of days offered. Regional meetings of agents which could not be classified under any subject-matter area or areas with any degree of accuracy heads the list of offerings with 13.50 days.[1] Other subject-matter areas offered for a week or more (5 days plus) were farm management (8.00 days), home grounds (7.00 days), vegetables and potatoes (5.50 days), and farm structures (5.00 days). Rural sociology is in the lowest position with only one day.[2]

If the number of days devoted to subject-matter areas concerned with technical information are added up, a total of 56.00 days were offered. The total for offerings dealing with methods was 20.50 days.[3]

---

[1] These are meetings of agents which are conducted by the agents themselves for the purpose of discussing mutual problems and plans.

[2] It should be noted that throughout the report some training meetings or sessions and, therefore, days were classified under more than one subject-matter area.

[3] Technical training includes farm management, home grounds, vegetables and potatoes, farm structures--dairy and poultry, poultry, resource development or conservation, commercial florists or horticulture, farm forage crops, dairy, fruit, livestock--beef, sheep, and swine, and marketing.

Methodological training includes Extension program development, Extension organization--orientation to, communications including Extension news, educational processes, Extension administration and supervision, Extension housekeeping, public affairs & rural sociology.

The classification of subject-matter areas according to technical and methodological areas is based on the judgment of the authors as to the major emphasis most likely in each area. Because the content of regional meetings of agents was unknown, it was not included in either category. It is also recognized that because some training meetings were classified under more than one subject-matter area, any attempt to add up days of training results in some distortion. Nevertheless, it is believed that despite this distortion a comparison of technical and methodological training is useful.

Two rapidly developing and related fields of Extension work, i.e., commercial florists or horticulture and home grounds, ranked first and second in number of days of induction and early training offered new assistant agents in 1963 (Table 3). These two areas were followed closely and in order by farm management, fruit, vegetables and potatoes, and farm forage crops. Five of the eight subject-matter areas dealing primarily with methodology had no offerings in induction and early training.

Technical training constituted 112.50 days, whereas training concerned primarily with methods amounted to only 15.00 days.[1] The large number of days devoted to technical training reflects the emphasis which the Early Training Schools at Cornell for assistant agents have given to basic agricultural subject-matter.

When all days of in-service training are considered, farm management ranks first followed closely by home grounds, commercial florists or horticulture, and vegetables and potatoes. Four methodological areas had the smallest number of days offered, i.e., 2.00. (Table 4)

---

[1] Technical training includes commercial florists or horticulture, home grounds, fruit, farm management, vegetables and potatoes, farm forage crops, farm structures--dairy and poultry, resource development or conservation, dairy, poultry, livestock--beef, sheep, and swine and marketing.

Methodological training includes Extension organization--orientation to, communications including Extension news, rural sociology, educational processes, Extension administration and supervision, Extension housekeeping, Extension program development and public affairs.

The classification of subject-matter areas according to technical and methodological areas is based on the judgment of the authors as to the major emphasis most likely in each area. Because the content of regional meetings of agents was unknown, it was not included in either category. It is also recognized that because some training sessions were classified under more than one subject-matter area, any attempt to add up days of training results in some distortion. Nevertheless, it is believed that despite this distortion a comparison of technical and methodological training is useful.

Table 3. Number of Days of Induction and Early Training at Cornell Offered, by Subject-matter Areas: 1963.

Areas of training[a]	Number of days offered[b]
Commercial florists or horticulture	15.75
Home grounds	15.25
Farm management	15.00
Fruit	14.00
Vegetables & potatoes	13.75
Farm forage crops	12.25
Extension organization--orientation to	8.50
Farm structures--dairy and poultry	6.00
Resource development or conservation	6.00
Dairy	5.75
Poultry	4.00
Livestock--beef, sheep, and swine	3.75
Communications including Extension news	3.50
Rural sociology	3.00
Marketing	1.00
Educational processes	0.00
Extension administration & supervision	0.00
Extension housekeeping	0.00
Extension program development	0.00
Public affairs	0.00

[a] Regional meetings of agents is excluded because this category by definition could not have occurred under induction and early training at Cornell.

[b] No total is given for these figures because some training sessions of the Induction and Early Training Schools and, therefore, days were classified under more than one subject-matter area.

Table 4. Number of Days of All In-service Training Offered, by Subject-matter Areas: 1963.

Areas of training	Number of days offered[a]
Farm management	23.00
Home grounds	22.25
Commercial florists or horticulture	19.75
Vegetables and potatoes	19.25
Fruit	17.50
Farm forage crops	16.25
Regional meetings of agents	13.50
Extension organization--orientation to	12.50
Farm structures--dairy and poultry	11.00
Resource development or conservation	10.50
Dairy	9.25
Poultry	8.50
Livestock--beef, sheep, and swine	7.25
Communications including Extension news	6.50
Extension program development	4.50
Marketing	4.00
Rural sociology	4.00
Educational processes	2.00
Extension administration & supervision	2.00
Extension housekeeping	2.00
Public affairs	2.00

[a] No total is given for these figures because some training meetings or sessions and, therefore, days were classified under more than one subject-matter area.

All areas of technical offerings amounted to 168.50 days. For offerings which were primarily methodological the total number of days was 35.50.[1]

In Table 5 the ranks of each subject-matter area according to number of hours of training offered are given for all in-service training, for refresher and other training, and for induction and early training. The subject-matter areas are listed in the table according to rank on number of days of all in-service training offered. Comparison of the rankings on refresher and other training with that for induction and early training gives some idea of relative emphasis in these two types of training which various subject-matter areas receive. However, the comparative rankings should not be taken to indicate an equal or unequal number of days offered as between the two types of training. Thus, for home grounds under refresher and other training 7.00 days of training were offered with a rank of two but under induction and early training the number of days offered was 15.25 with a rank of two also.

For 14 of the 20 areas[2] of subject-matter the relative emphasis between the two types of training offered is not greatly different (a difference of 3 rank points or less), but for the remaining six

---

[1] Technical training includes farm management, home grounds, commercial florists or horticulture, vegetables and potatoes, fruit, farm forage crops, farm structures--dairy and poultry, resource development or conservation, dairy, poultry, livestock--beef, sheep, and swine, and marketing.

Methodological training includes Extension organization--orientation to, communications including Extension news, Extension program development, rural sociology, educational processes, Extension administration & supervision, Extension housekeeping, and public affairs.

The classification of subject-matter areas according to technical and methodological areas is based on the judgment of the authors as to the major emphasis most likely in each area. Because the content of regional meetings of agents was unknown, it was not included in either category. It is also recognized that because some training meetings or sessions were classified under more than one subject-matter area, any attempt to add up days of training results in some distortion. Nevertheless, it is believed that despite this distortion a comparison of technical and methodological training is useful.

[2] Regional meetings of agents is excluded in this discussion because this category by definition could not have occurred under induction and early training at Cornell.

Table 5. Ranking of Areas of Training for All In-service Training, Refresher and Other Training, and Induction and Early Training at Cornell According to Number of Days of Training Offered: 1963.[a]

Areas of training	Rank according to number of days offered		
	All in-service training	Refresher & other training	Induction & early training at Cornell
Farm management	1	1	3
Home grounds	2	2	2
Commercial florists or horticulture	3	9	1
Vegetables and potatoes	4	3	5
Fruit	5	12	4
Farm forage crops	6	9	6
Extension organization--orientation to	7	9	7
Farm structures	8	4	8.5
Resource development	9	6	8.5
Dairy	10	12	10
Poultry	11	6	11
Livestock--beef, sheep, and swine	12	12	12
Communications including Extension news	13	14.5	13
Extension program development	14	6	18[b]
Marketing	15.5	14.5	15
Rural sociology	15.5	20	14
Educational processes	18.5	17.5	18[b]
Extension administration & supervision	18.5	17.5	18[b]
Extension housekeeping	18.5	17.5	18[b]
Public affairs	18.5	17.5	18[b]

[a] Regional meetings of agents is omitted in this table because this category by definition could not be included under induction and early training offered at Cornell.

[b] No days of training were offered.

areas the differences range from four to 12 rank points. Extension program development, farm structures and poultry received greater emphasis relative to other areas in refresher and other training than they did in induction and early training. On the other hand, commercial florists or horticulture, fruit and rural sociology ranked much higher among the subject-matter areas in number of days offered under induction and early training than under refresher and other training.

Number of Days of Training Received by Classes of Agents

According to Table 6, the average (median) number of actual days of refresher and other training received in 1963 by all (168) agents was 12.8. The averages for the various classes of agents were 15.5 days for the head agents, 12.3 for associate agents, 9.5 for assistant agents, and 7.4 for regional agents. Only one per cent of the agents had no training. Four per cent of the agents had from 20.0 - 24.9 days of training. This large number of days of training was accounted for by 10 per cent of the head agents and two per cent of the assistant agents.

Induction and early training at Cornell is designed primarily for new assistant agents. Hence, no head agents received this type of training in 1963. The categories for number of days of training which appear in Table 7 correspond to the days of training for each induction school held at Cornell during the year and each year-group of early trainees. Each induction school runs for 9.5 days and each year-group of trainees has 15 days of early training.[1] Only a few associate or regional agents had any induction and/or early training in 1963, and these were either agents who were newly employed in New York Extension Service or who had moved up to associate agent after having had one or two years of early training. Eighteen per

---

[1] In 1963 there were two induction schools and three groups of early trainees, one of which had its third and final year of early training; one, its second year; and one, its first year. The number of days of training reported for induction and early training are registered days. Actual days of training for each agent were not available for this type of training.

Table 6. Percentage Distribution of Agricultural Agents According to Actual Number of Days of Refresher or Other Training Received, by Class of Agents: 1963.

Number of days of training	Agents (N=58)	Associate agents (N=61)	Assistant agents (N=40)	Regional agents (N=9)	Total (N=168)
	Per cent				
None	2	-	-	11	1
0.1 - 4.9	-	7	18	11	7
5.0 - 9.9	5	21	35	56	21
10.0 - 14.9	38	46	25	11	36
15.0 - 19.9	45	26	20	11	31
20.0 - 24.9	10	-	2	-	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Median	15.5	12.3	9.5	7.4	12.8

Table 7. Percentage Distribution of Agricultural Agents According to Number of Registered Days of Induction and Early Training (at Cornell) Received, by Class of Agents: 1963.

Number of days of training	Agents (N=58)	Associate agents (N=61)	Assistant agents (N=40)	Regional agents (N=9)	Total (N=168)
	Per cent				
None	100	89	18	78	76
9.5	-	-	22	-	5
15.0	-	9	42	11	14
24.5	-	2	18	11	5
Total	100	100	100	100	100

cent of the assistant agents took no induction or early training in 1963. Most, if not all of them, were probably employed too late to take one or the other or both of these kinds of training. Twenty-two per cent of the assistants had induction training only (9.5 days). These were mostly, if not entirely, agents employed too late in the year to enroll in the 1963 Early Training School. Forty-two per cent of the assistants received early training only. Most, if not all, of these had already had induction training. Eighteen per cent of the assistants had both induction and early training in 1963.

Because of the well developed program of induction and early training which has now become a high priority requirement for new assistant agents, the average (median) number (24.9) of days of total training for assistant agents in 1963 was considerably higher than that of any other class of agents (Table 8). The head agent group came next with an average of 15.5 days, followed by associate agents with 13.1 days and by regional agents with 8.0 days. The average for all agents was 15.3 days. Only one per cent of the agents had no in-service training in 1963, but 18 per cent had less than 10 days.

Attendance and Length of Refresher and Other Training Meetings

Since the Induction and Early Training Schools were for 9.5 and 15 continuous days respectively, it was not considered useful or meaningful to attempt for this type of training the kind of presentation which is given for refresher and other training in Table 9. There were 102 refresher and early training meetings in 1963. The mean registered attendance for these 102 meetings was 16.5 and the median was 15.4. The range in attendance was great, from two to 131.

Seventy-eight per cent of the refresher and other training meetings were one day in length. Three, or three per cent, of the meetings were for only a half-day. Twelve, or 12 per cent, of the meetings were from 2.00 to 3.50 days in length. Perhaps consideration needs to be given to the effectiveness of training which involves only one day of exposure.

Man Days of Training Received

The actual man days of training received by all (168) agents in 1963 and the percentages which this training was of the estimated

Table 8. Percentage Distribution of Agricultural Agents According to Number of Days of Total Training Received, by Class of Agents: 1963.[a]

Number of days of training	Agents (N=58)	Associate agents (N=61)	Assistant agents (N=40)	Regional agents (N=9)	Total (N=168)
None	2	-	-	11	1
0.1 - 4.9	-	7	10	11	5
5.0 - 9.9	5	18	5	45	12
10.0 - 14.9	38	38	8	-	29
15.0 - 19.9	45	23	12	11	27
20.0 - 24.9	10	5	15	-	9
25.0 - 29.9	-	5	18	11	7
30.0 - 34.9	-	2	22	11	7
35.0 - 39.9	-	2	5	-	2
40.0 - 44.5	-	-	5	-	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Median	15.5	13.1	24.9	8.0	15.3

[a] Number of days of total training is the sum of actual days of refresher and other training and registered days of induction and early training.

Table 9. Distribution of Subject-matter Training Meetings of Refresher and Other Training According to Number of Agents Registered as Attending, by Length in Days of Meetings: 1963.[a]

No. of agents attending	Length of subject-matter training meetings in days								
	.50	1.00	1.50	2.00	2.50	3.00	3.50	Total	Per cent
2		1						1	1
3		2						2	2
4		1						1	1
5		2	2					4	4
6		4						4	4
7		2	1					3	3
8		5	1					6	6
9		5		1				6	6
10		4				1		5	5
11		3	1	1				5	5
12		2	1					3	3
13		4		1				5	5
14		2					1	3	3
15		7						7	6
16	1	9						10	9
17	1	5						6	6
18		1						1	1
19	1	4						5	5
20		5						5	5
21		4						4	4
22		2						2	2
23		2		1				3	3
24		1		1				2	2
25		2		1				3	3
29				1				1	1
36					1			1	1
49		1						1	1
55			1		1			2	2
131				1				1	1
Total	3	80	7	8	2	1	1	102	100
Per cent	3	78	7	8	2	1	1	100	

[a]The attendance reported in this table is registered attendance because this kind of attendance was the only kind that could be used for construction of such a table. It should be noted that some agents did not remain in attendance during the entire period of some training meetings.

total man days of work (including training) of these agents were:

Type of training	Man days of training	Per cent of estimated total man days of work[1]
Refresher and other training	2084.75[2]	5.6
Induction and early training	666.00[3]	1.8
Total training	2750.75	7.4

There is no known standard against which to evaluate the percentage of total man days which was devoted to in-service training. The 7.4 per cent for all training appears to be a reasonable percentage, and the relationship of percentages of time devoted to refresher and other training and induction and early training appears to be equally reasonable. At least, the figures provide some idea as to the emphasis which in-service training as well as types of such training received during one year.

In the following discussion of Tables 10, 11, and 12, attention is called to the fact that there is overlapping of man days among some of the areas of training. This overlapping is the result of assigning man days of training to more than one area of training in those instances where the subject-matter applied to two or more areas. (See Appendix E for the details of this overlapping.)

Farm management certainly looms important in refresher and other training with 563.50 man days of training, or 1.5 per cent of all work days of the 168 agents (Table 10). The number of days devoted to this subject-matter area is 2.3 times greater than the number devoted to the next ranking area, i.e., regional meetings of agents, or 3.5 times that of the third ranking area, i.e., Extension program development. The training emphasis on farm management is

---

[1]Estimated total man days for a year for the 168 agents = 36,855 man days. This figure was arrived at by using a 234 day work year. However, because some agents were employed less than a year, 36,855 is less than the product of 168 x 234.

[2]These are actual man days of training and were used in order to provide as accurately as possible an indication of attendance for refresher and other training which is the major emphasis of the study. In reality, the difference between actual and registered attendance was relatively small.

[3]These are registered man days of training. No record of actual attendance was available.

Table 10. Actual Number of Man Days of Refresher and Other Training Received by Agents, by Areas of Training, with Per Cent Which Man Days of Training Are of Total Work Days of 168 Agents: 1963.[a]

Areas of training	Man days of training received[c]	Per cent of total work days[d]
Farm management	563.50	1.5
Regional meetings of agents	243.00	0.6
Extension program development	160.00	0.4
Dairy	155.50	0.4
Farm forage crops	120.00	0.3
Vegetables and potatoes	108.00	0.3
Public affairs	86.75	0.2
Farm structures--dairy and poultry	82.50	0.2
Resource development or conservation	70.00	0.2
Extension organization--orientation to	67.00	0.2
Extension administration & supervision	65.00	0.2
Home grounds	51.00	0.1
Communications including Extension news[b]	50.50	0.1
Poultry	50.50	0.1
Marketing	47.50	0.1
Fruit	43.00	0.1
Educational processes	38.00	0.1
Livestock--beef, sheep, and swine	36.50	0.1
Commercial florists or horticulture	34.00	0.1
Extension housekeeping	33.00	0.1
Rural sociology	15.00	0.04

[a]Actual attendance of agents at training meetings as recorded has been used in this table. Thus, partial attendance as a one, two, etc., day session is used where possible for each agent and not simply the number of days of the session. Actual attendance has been used to give as accurate a picture of refresher and other training as possible since this type of training is the major concern of the report.

[b]Subject-matter concerned Extension news only

[c]No total is given for this column because man days were classified under more than one area of training in those instances where the subject matter applied to two or more areas.

[d]Total work days=36,855 for 168 agents. This is an estimate based on 234 days for a work year, but the estimate involved some exceptional cases so that it was not arrived at simply by multiplying 234 by 168.

related to at least two factors: 1) the emphasis placed on this area by the Farm and Home Management Program in the State, and 2) the increasing recognition of the necessity for good management in the tight competitive situation in which agriculture finds itself.

The regional meetings of agents devoted to a variety of interests which could not be accurately classified under subject-matter categories constitute a considerable number of man days, second to but considerably below the number of man days devoted to farm management. These meetings are planned and conducted by the agents and provide opportunities for exchange of experience and joint planning of programs, etc. Whether or not the results justify the amount of time spent is unknown, although the question is one that agents and supervisors may want to examine.

If the subject-matter areas relating to the technical information are combined, the number of man days devoted to these areas amounted to 1,362.00 or 3.7 per cent of the 168 agents' total work days for 1963. Refresher and other training concerned essentially with methods accounted for 515.25 man days, or 1.4 per cent of the agents' work days for 1963. Thus, training received in technical areas amounted to 2.7 times that received in essentially methodological areas.[1]

---

[1]Technical training includes farm management, dairy, farm forage crops, vegetables and potatoes, farm structures--dairy and poultry, resource development or conservation, home grounds, poultry, marketing, fruit, livestock--beef, sheep, swine, and commercial florists or horticulture.

Methodological training includes Extension program development, public affairs, Extension organization--orientation to, Extension administration & supervision, communications including Extension news, educational processes, Extension housekeeping, and rural sociology.

The classification of subject-matter areas according to technical and methodological areas is based on the judgment of the authors as to the major emphasis most likely in each area. Because the content of regional meetings of agents was unknown, it was not included in either category. It is also recognized that because some training meetings were classified under more than one subject-matter area, any attempt to add up days of training results in some distortion. Nevertheless, it is believed that despite this distortion a comparison of technical and methodological training is useful.

In 1963 there were two induction schools at Cornell for new agents and, for the first time, three groups of trainees in the Early Training School at Cornell, i.e., a beginning group, a two-year group, and a three-year group. Farm management, commercial florists or horticulture, home grounds, vegetables and potatoes, farm forage crops, and fruit in that order are the subject-matter areas which had the largest numbers of man days of induction and early training (Table 11). The percentages of total work days of all agents devoted to these five areas were either 0.4 or 0.3.

The technical training received in the Induction and Early Training Schools amounted to 1024.75 man days, or 2.8 per cent of all work days for the 168 agents. Training received in areas essentially concerned with methods amounted to only 148.75 days, or 0.4 per cent of all work days of the 168 agents. Of the eight subject-matter areas classified as methodological, no man days of training were received in five. The technical training received was 6.9 times as much as that received in methodological fields. This relationship may or may not be desirable, but it is hoped the information about it may stimulate thinking on the part of those responsible for planning induction and early training.[1]

---

[1]Technical training includes farm management, commercial florists or horticulture, home grounds, vegetables and potatoes, farm forage crops, fruit, farm structures--dairy and poultry, resource development or conservation, dairy, poultry, livestock--beef, sheep, swine, and marketing.

Methodological training includes Extension organization--orientation to, communications including Extension news, rural sociology, educational processes, Extension administration & supervision, Extension housekeeping, Extension program development and public affairs.

The classification of subject-matter areas according to technical and methodological areas is based on the judgment of the authors as to the major emphasis most likely in each area. Because the content of regional meetings of agents was unknown, it was not included in either category. It is also recognized that because some training sessions were classified under more than one subject-matter area, any attempt to add up days of training results in some distortion. Nevertheless, it is believed that despite this distortion a comparison of technical and methodological training is useful.

Table 11. Number of Man Days of Induction and Early Training (at Cornell) Received, by Areas of Training, with Per Cent Which Man Days of Training Are of Total Work Days of 168 Agents: 1963.[a]

Areas of training[b]	Man days of training received[c]	Per cent of total work days[d]
Farm management	148.50	0.4
Commercial florists or horticulture	131.25	0.4
Home grounds	129.75	0.4
Vegetables and potatoes	121.50	0.3
Farm forage crops	120.75	0.3
Fruit	120.50	0.3
Extension organization--orientation to	78.25	0.2
Farm structures--dairy and poultry	65.50	0.2
Resource development or conservation	61.50	0.2
Dairy	49.50	0.1
Communications including Extension news	37.75	0.1
Poultry	33.50	0.1
Rural sociology	32.75	0.1
Livestock--beef, sheep, and swine	32.50	0.1
Marketing	10.00	0.02
Educational processes	0.00	0.0
Extension administration & supervision	0.00	0.0
Extension housekeeping	0.00	0.0
Extension program development	0.00	0.0
Public affairs	0.00	0.0

[a] Registered attendance of agents has been used in this table because no record of partial attendance was available.

[b] Regional meetings of agents is omitted in this table because this category by definition could not be included under induction and early training at Cornell.

[c] No total is given for this column because man days were classified under more than one area of training in those instances where the subject matter applied to two or more areas.

[d] Total work days=36,855 for 168 agents. This is an estimate based on 234 days for a work year, but the estimate involved some exceptional cases so that it was not arrived at simply by multiplying 234 by 168.

Table 12 gives the total man days of training by subject-matter areas which agricultural agents received in 1963. Farm management ranked first in total man days of training received with 712.00 man days, or 1.9 per cent of total work days of the 168 agents. This number of man days devoted to farm management is approximately 2.9 times that of the next ranking area, regional meetings, as well as the third ranking (actual subject-matter area) field, farm forage crops.

Three subject-matter areas which are essentially methodological are at the bottom of the list. These are Extension housekeeping with 33.00 man days, educational processes with 38.00, and rural sociology with 47.75.

All technical subject-matter man days of training received amounted to 2,386.75, or 6.5 per cent of total work days of the 168 agents; whereas the total for methodological subject-matter was 664.00 or 1.8 per cent of total work days of the 168 agents. The former was 3.6 times the latter.[1]

---

[1] Technical training includes farm management, farm forage crops, vegetables and potatoes, dairy, home grounds, commercial florists or horticulture, fruit, farm structures--dairy and poultry, resource development or conservation, poultry, livestock--beef, sheep, swine, and marketing.

Methodological training includes Extension program development, Extension organization--orientation to, communications including Extension news, public affairs, Extension administration & supervision, rural sociology, educational processes, Extension housekeeping.

The classification of subject-matter areas according to technical and methodological areas is based on the judgment of the authors as to the major emphasis most likely in each area. Because the content of regional meetings of agents was unknown, it was not included in either category. It is also recognized that because some training meetings or sessions were classified under more than one subject-matter area, any attempt to add up days of training results in some distortion. Nevertheless, it is believed that despite this distortion a comparison of technical and methodological training is useful.

Table 12. Number of Man Days of All Types of Training Received, by Areas of Training, with Per Cent Which Man Days of Training Are of Total Work Days of 168 Agents: 1963.[a]

Areas of training	Man days of training received[b]	Per cent of total work days[c]
Farm management	712.00	1.9
Regional meetings of agents	243.00	0.6
Farm forage crops	240.75	0.6
Vegetables and potatoes	229.50	0.6
Dairy	205.00	0.6
Home grounds	180.75	0.5
Commercial florists or horticulture	165.25	0.4
Fruit	163.50	0.4
Extension program development	160.00	0.4
Farm structures--dairy and poultry	148.00	0.4
Extension organization--orientation to	145.25	0.4
Resource development or conservation	131.50	0.4
Communications including Extension news	88.25	0.2
Public affairs	86.75	0.2
Poultry	84.00	0.2
Livestock--beef, sheep, and swine	69.00	0.2
Extension administration & supervision	65.00	0.2
Marketing	57.50	0.2
Rural sociology	47.75	0.1
Educational processes	38.00	0.1
Extension housekeeping	33.00	0.1

[a]Number of man days for all types of training was obtained by adding actual attendance for refresher and other training and registered attendance for induction and early training. It was impossible to obtain actual attendance for induction and early training. Since the difference between actual and registered attendance for refresher and other training was small, the figures for all training are affected very little.

[b]No total is given for this column because man days were classified under more than one area of training in those instances where the subject matter applied to two or more areas.

[c]Total work days=36,855 for 168 agents. This is an estimate based on 234 days for a work year, but the estimate involved some exceptional cases so that it was not arrived at simply by multiplying 234 by 168.

In Table 13 the ranks of each subject-matter area according to number of man days of training received are given for all in-service training, for refresher and other training, and for induction and early training. The subject-matter areas are listed in the table according to rank on number of days of all in-service training received. Comparison of the rankings on refresher and other training with that for induction and early training gives some idea of the relative emphasis in extent of reception for these two types of training. The comparative rankings, however, should not be taken to indicate an equal or unequal number of days of training received as between the two types of training. Thus, for farm management under refresher and other training the number of man days of training received was 563.50 with a rank of one but under induction and early training the number of man days of training received was 148.50 with a rank of one also.

For 11 of the 20 areas of subject-matter,[1] when compared in terms of rank order, the relative emphasis within the two types of training is not greatly different (a difference of three rank points or less) but for the remaining nine areas the differences ranged from four to 16 rank points.

Relationship of Training Received to Work In-put

Table 14 presents data which show the relationship of amount of refresher and other training received to the work in-put of agents by major areas of work. (See Appendix F for form used in reporting agent's work in-put.) As was pointed out in the Purpose and Methodology section, work in-put data were obtained for the year 1963 by asking each county agricultural office to provide for each of its agents employed at any time during the year the total number of days of work according to areas of work. These data are initially reported by agents each month on the Agent's Monthly Report form. Not all of the information on the form could be used. Only those work areas which corresponded enough with or could be combined to correspond with subject-matter categories already used in classifying in-service training were included. As was indicated in the section on Purpose and Methodology, the initial categories used in classifying the subject-matter of training were the assignment areas which

---

[1] Regional meetings of agents is excluded in this discussion because this category by definition could have had no man days for induction and early training.

Table 13. Ranking of Areas of Training for All In-service Training, Refresher and Other Training, and Induction and Early Training at Cornell According to Man Days of Training Received: 1963.[a]

Areas of training	Rank according to man days of training[b]		
	All in-service training	Refresher & other training	Induction & early training at Cornell
Farm management	1	1	1
Farm forage crops	2	4	4
Vegetables and potatoes	3	5	5
Dairy	4	3	10
Home grounds	5	11	3
Commercial florists or horticulture	6	18[c]	2
Fruit	7	15	6
Extension program development	8	2	18[c]
Farm structures--dairy and poultry	9	7	8
Extension organization--orientation to	10	9	7
Resource development or conservation	11	8	9
Communications including Extension news	12	12.5	11
Public affairs	13	6	18[c]
Poultry	14	12.5	14
Livestock--beef, sheep, and swine	15	17	13
Extension administration & supervision	16	10	18[c]
Marketing	17	14	15
Rural sociology	18	20	12
Educational processes	19	16	18[c]
Extension housekeeping	20	19	18[c]

[a] Regional meetings of agents is omitted in this table because this category by definition could not be included under induction and early training received at Cornell.

[b] Man days for refresher and other training which these ranks represent were actual attendance, for induction and early training registered attendance, and for all in-service training the first two added together. The difference between registered and actual attendance for refresher and other training was small, hence, the comparison of ranks is affected very little by using the two kinds of attendance.

[c] No man days of training received.

Table 14. Relationship of Amount of Refresher and Other Training Received to Amount of Work In-put of Agricultural Agents, by Subject-matter Areas: 1963.

(1) Areas of work	(2) Agents with no work days but some training		(3) Agents with 0.1-20.0 days of work but no training		(4) Continuous rise in average no. of days of training as no. of days of work increased for those taking training in each area	(5) Rise in avg. no. of days of training from lowest category to highest for days of work in-put for those taking training in each area	(6) Category of no. of days of work with highest average no. of days of training for those taking training in each area
	No.	%[a]	No.	%[b]			
Commercial florists or horticulture	0	0.0	57	90.5	No	Yes	60.1+
Dairy	6	13.0	33	52.4	No	Yes	40.1-60.0
Farm forage crops	12	37.5	37	58.7	No	Yes	40.1-60.0
Farm management	16	59.3	12	14.5	Yes	Yes	60.1+
Farm structures--dairy & poultry	1	2.6	78	74.3	No	Yes	60.1+
Fruit	0	0.0	71	98.6	No	No	0.1-10.0 20.1-40.0 40.1-60.0
Home grounds	3	5.5	83	91.2	No	Yes	60.1+
Livestock--beef, sheep, and swine	1	1.4	69	85.2	No	No	None 20.1-40.0
Marketing	7	15.2	79	71.2	No	No	10.1-20.0
Poultry	1	1.1	56	81.2	No	Yes	60.1+
Public affairs	6	9.5	53	63.1	Yes	Yes	40.1-60.0
Resource development or conservation	9	27.3	80	72.7	No	Yes	60.1+
Vegetables and potatoes	2	3.1	59	73.8	No	Yes	60.1+

[a]Percentages are based on total number of agents with no work days for each subject-matter area.
[b]Percentages are based on total number of agents with 0.1 - 20.0 work days for each subject-matter area.

the state leaders of agriculture have developed as means of identifying the responsibility of individual agents.[1] The relating of training received to actual work in-put followed an original effort to relate training to assignment areas. Thus, initially the training meetings were classified by assignment areas; however, it was discovered that for individual agents, assignments listed on the state leaders' chart were not entirely reliable. At this point, it was decided that actual days of work in-put as reported by agents would probably be more accurate. Accordingly, the work areas on the agent's monthly report form were converted to the assignment areas which had already been used in classifying the subject-matter of in-service training. By following this procedure not all of the work areas on the agent's monthly report form could be used. However, the procedure did result in the inclusion of those areas which are concerned with the major substance of agricultural Extension teaching. The "areas of work" which appear in Tables 14 (page 33) and 15 (page 37) are listed below opposite each of which is the work area or areas that appear on the agent's monthly report form:

Areas of work listed on tables	Work areas on agent's monthly report form
Commercial florists or horticulture	Flowers, nursery, turf
Dairy	Dairy
Farm forage crops	Field crops
Farm management	Business management--1) general program 2) formal farm management program
Farm structures--dairy and poultry	Engineering
Fruit	Fruit
Home grounds	Home and gardens
Livestock--beef, sheep, swine	Livestock

[1] Two minor modifications were made in these assignment areas. Beef, sheep, and swine which appeared as separate areas were combined into one category, namely, livestock, and poultry structures and dairy structures were combined into one category, i.e., farm structures.

Areas of work listed on tables (Cont.)	Work areas on agent's monthly report form (Cont.)
Marketing	Marketing (combination of four sub-items)
Poultry	Poultry
Public affairs	Public problems & community improvement
Resource development or conservation	Natural resources and forestry
Vegetables & potatoes	Vegetables

For seven of the 13 work areas there is relatively little refresher and other training which was taken by agents who did no work in these areas (See column 2, Table 14). These seven areas are commercial florists or horticulture, farm structures, fruit, home grounds, livestock, poultry, and vegetables and potatoes. This certainly emphasizes the fact that agents were taking training that was relevant to their current work.

There are three work areas, i.e., farm forage crops, farm management, and resource development, which have rather higher percentages of agents who did no work in these areas but had some training. The percentage for farm forage crops is 37.5; for farm management, 59.3; and for resource development, 27.3. The explanation for these high percentages of agents doing no work in these areas but having training in them grows out of the difficulty of relating subject-matter areas to work areas. Thus, subject-matter which was classified as farm management may also be of such a nature that agents working in other fields see th necessity for taking training in farm management. Moreover, some subject-matter that is more or less in the general field of agricultural economics was classified under farm management since it could be considered relevant and since the farm management category had been used throughout the study. In the case of farm forage crops, it is undoubtedly true that agents not working in this specific field but in dairying would take training in this area and yet report no days of work for the area. Resource development which includes rural development as reported on the agent's work report form is a new field of Extension concern, and it is possible that agents took training applicable to this area in anticipation of assignments.

Twelve of the 13 areas of work included in Table 14 (See column 3) had 52.4 per cent or more of those agents working from 0.1 to 20.0 days in these areas who had no refresher or other training therein. The work in-put category of 0.1 through 20.0 represents a very limited amount of work, with the maximum number of days being only 20, or about one month of work. Perhaps, agents whose work in-put is this low in a given area do only incidental, emergency, or fill-in work and, hence, do not seek refresher training in that area. The low per cent (14.5) of the agents doing work in farm management and receiving no training stands out. It is possible that the technical nature of this field and the more formal manner in which farm management is programmed may account for this.

Except for farm management and public affairs, there is no continuous rise in average (mean) number of days of training for those taking training in each area as the number of days of work increases (See column 4, Table 14; also Table 1, Appendix F). Reference to column 5 of Table 14 will show, however, that for ten of the 13 areas of work there is a rise in average (mean) number of days of refresher and other training for those taking training in each area from the lowest compared to the highest category of number of work days. Thus, broadly there is a positive relationship between amount of work in-put and amount of refresher and other training.

For seven of the 13 areas of work the highest average (mean) number of days of refresher and other training for those taking training in each area is in the highest category of number of days of work in-put (column 6, Table 14). Thus, those agents spending the greatest number compared to those spending smaller numbers of work days in the areas of commercial florists, farm management, farm structures, home grounds, poultry, resource development and vegetables and potatoes are also the agents who received the highest average (mean) number of days of refresher training in these areas. Perhaps, some examination should be made of the areas of work where this did not occur in order to see whether or not these areas need a greater amount of refresher training for those most heavily engaged in them.

Data relating to the relationship of amount of induction and early training to amount of work in-put of agricultural agents (mostly new assistant agents) are presented in Table 15. This type of training, particularly early training, is not necessarily designed to give the agent training which is related to the immediate work, especially that in which he may be involved during a given year of such training. The agents who take early training usually begin this training during the first twelve months of their employment.

Table 15. Relationship of Amount of Induction and Early Training to Amount of Work In-put of Agricultural Agents, by Subject-matter Areas: 1963.

(1) Areas of work	(2) Agents with no work days but some training		(3) Agents with 0.1-20.0 days of work but no training		(4) Continuous rise in average no. of days of training as no. of days of work increased for those taking training in each area	(5) Rise in avg. no. of days of training from lowest category to highest for days of work in-put for those taking training in each area	(6) Category of no. of days of work with highest average no. of days of training for those taking training in each area
	No.	%[a]	No.	%[b]			
Commercial florists or horticulture	17	20.2	52	82.5	No	No	0.1-10.0
Dairy	6	13.0	49	77.8	No	Yes	60.1+
Farm forage crops	8	25.0	51	81.0	No	Yes	40.1-60.0
Farm management	12	44.4	69	83.1	No	Yes	60.1+
Farm structures--dairy & poultry	15	39.5	82	78.1	No	Yes	40.1-60.0
Fruit	17	21.5	55	76.4	No	Yes	60.1+
Home grounds	13	23.6	75	82.4	No	No	None
Livestock--beef, sheep, and swine	15	20.8	64	79.0	No	Yes	10.1-20.0
Marketing	5	10.9	106	95.5	No	No	None 0.1-10.0 10.1-20.0
Poultry	19	21.6	54	78.3	No	No	10.1-20.0
Public affairs	No training offered		No training offered		No training offered	No training offered	No training offered
Resource development or conservation	6	18.2	83	75.5	No	No	20.1-40.0
Vegetables and potatoes	15	23.4	61	76.3	No	Yes	60.1+

[a]Percentages are based on total number of agents with no work days for each subject-matter area.

[b]Percentages are based on total number of agents with 0.1 - 20.0 work days for each subject-matter area.

In 1963 there were three groups of agents who received early training, i.e., a group which began in 1961 and was in its third and final year of this type of training, a group which began in 1962 and was in its second year, and a group which began in 1963 and was in its first year. The data in column 2 of Table 15 support the fact that the induction and early training which the new agents receive is broader than their actual work in-put. Thus, nine of the 13 areas of work had 20.0 per cent or more of the agents who did no work in these areas but had taken some training in them.

The agents with a relatively small number of work days (0.1 - 20.0) (See column 3, Table 15) also had high percentages with no induction or early training in all areas of work. The range in percentages was from 75.5 to 95.5 with an average (mean) of 80.5. The range of percentages of agents with no refresher and other training who had 0.1 to 20.0 days of work for 1963 was from 14.5 to 98.6 with an average of 71.3. Thus, in general, induction and early training was not serving the incidental, limited needs of agents as much as was refresher and other training.

For no area of work was there a continuous rise in average days of training for those taking training in each area as the number of work days increased (See column 4, Table 15; also Table 2, Appendix F). However, in two work areas for refresher and other training this occurred. Seven of the 12 areas of work in which induction and early training was offered had rises in average number of days of training for those taking training in each area from the lowest to highest category for number of days of work (See column 5, Table 15). This was 58 per cent of the 12 areas of work compared to 85 per cent of the 13 areas of work for refresher and other training. Both of these comparisons seem to indicate that the induction and early training of new agents is less directed to immediate work than is the case of refresher and other training. This conclusion is further supported when it is noted that for only five[1] of the 12 areas of work (42 per cent) did the highest average (mean) number of days of training for those taking training in each area fall in the highest category of day of work in-put (See column 6, Table 15). In the case of early training this occurred for seven out of 13 areas of work (54 per cent).

---

[1] One of these five areas had the highest average in both the 60+ category and 40.1 - 60.0 category.

APPENDIX A

ATTENDANCE AT IN-SERVICE TRAINING MEETING OR CONFERENCE[1]

Name of meeting (or conference) _____

Purpose of school _____

Person responsible _____

Date(s) of meeting: Begin date _____ Time of day _____

End date _____ Time of day _____

Teachers and other resource people (list all including person responsible for meeting)

_____

_____

_____

Please circulate to conference attendants and have them fill out.

BE SURE TO FILL OUT ALL FOUR COLUMNS

(1) Name	(2) Title (agent, assoc., asst.)	(3) County	(4) No. of days & parts of days expect to attend

[1] A meeting is defined as a teaching situation involving 2 or more agents and a specialist.

BE SURE TO FILL OUT ALL FOUR COLUMNS

(1) Name	(2) Title (agent, assoc., asst.)	(3) County	(4) No. of days & parts of days expect to attend

APPENDIX B

Dear

It was agreed at the Department Extension Leaders' meeting on May 7, 1962, that a simple record keeping system on the attendance of agents at in-service training meetings would be tried experimentally during the next year. The form to be used for this purpose is attached to this letter. The purpose of this record keeping is to help specialists and state leaders have a better picture of the extent to which agents assigned to specialized fields are receiving training in those fields. Since a part of the record will provide an indication of the amount of time devoted to each training conference, this information can be used to estimate how much time each agent has given to in-service training in each of his assigned fields. The information will also be useful to the In-service Training Committee which has responsibilities for over-all planning of training for agents.

The major responsibility the specialist will have for the record keeping will be to fill in the first five items at the top of the first page of the form and then have the agents attending training meetings fill in the remainder of the form. After this is done it will be helpful to make a quick check to see that each agent has completed the three columns to the right of his name. If some failed to do this, the form should be circulated again. It may be desirable to circulate the form before lunch or after the first coffee break. The idea is to try to obtain a list of all who attend, being sure to catch latecomers.

It is planned to have records of attendance kept for each formal meeting and for each informal training session involving a specialist and two or more agents. The forms for the <u>formal meetings</u> will be sent to those specialists who are responsible for the meetings about a week in advance accompanied by a self-addressed envelope for returning them. Several copies of the same form for <u>informal meetings</u> are being sent in this letter to all specialists. Informal meetings are those where a specialist meets with two or three agents to teach them and bring them up-to-date. It is not a formally scheduled training conference. Each specialist will be left on his own to send in forms for these informal training meetings. He will be sent a card about every two months reminding him to send in any attendance forms which he may have had filled out. It is hoped that these informal training sessions with two or three agents will be reported because it is believed they constitute a considerable block of training.

The data on the forms will be tabulated and analyzed by the Office of Extension Studies at the end of a year of record keeping. The analysis will include a chart which will show the in-service training record of each agent by each of his assigned fields. Thus, you will not be burdened with the compilation or analysis of the data.

We hope that you will join us in this trial effort to study our in-service training. The Office of Extension Studies is responsible for the operations of the record keeping and will take the initiative in sending out the forms and reminding you to return them.

Sincerely yours,

C. R. Harrington
State Leader of Agricultural Agents

Frank D. Alexander
Administrative Specialist in
Extension Studies

APPENDIX C

Dear

It was agreed at the Department Extension Leaders' meeting on May 7, 1962, that a simple record keeping system on the attendance of agents at in-service training meetings would be tried experimentally during the next year. The form to be used for this purpose is attached to this letter. The purpose of this record keeping is to help specialists and state leaders have a better picture of the extent to which agents assigned to specialized fields are receiving training in those fields. Since the record form provides for an indication of amount of time devoted to each training conference, this information can be used to estimate how much time each agent has given to in-service training in each of his assigned fields. The information will be especially useful to the In-service Training Committee which has responsibilities for over-all planning of the training of agents.

Since state leaders are responsible for certain training conferences, records of attendance at these meetings will be needed. The major responsibility you will have for the record keeping is to fill in the first five items at the top of the first page of the form and then have the agents in attendance at conferences for which you are responsible fill the remainder of the form. After this is done, it will be helpful to make a quick check to see that each agent has completed the three columns to the right of his name. If some have failed to do this, the form should be circulated again. It may be desirable to circulate the form before lunch or after the first coffee break. The idea is to try to obtain a list of all who attend, being sure to catch latecomers.

The forms for the training meetings for which you are responsible will be sent to you two or three days in advance accompanied by a self-addressed envelope for returning them.

The data on the forms will be tabulated and analyzed by the Office of Extension Studies at the end of a year of record keeping. The analysis will include a chart which will show the in-service training record of each agent by each of his assigned fields. Thus, you will not be burdened with the compilation or analysis of the data.

We feel certain that you recognize the importance of this record keeping and analysis and hope that you will help us make it a success. The Office of Extension Studies is responsible for the operations of the record keeping and will take the initiative in sending out the forms and reminding you to return them.

Sincerely yours,

Frank D. Alexander
Administrative Specialist in
Extension Studies

APPENDIX D

ATTENDANCE AT INSERVICE TRAINING CONFERENCES

1. Name of agent _____

2. County _____ _____

3. Date employed _____

4. Title and year _____ _____

5. Assignments - 196

6. Name of Formal training	Purpose	Date		No. days expect. attend
		Time Beg.- of day	Time End-of day	

6. Name of formal training	Purpose	Date Beg.-of day	Time End-of day	No. days expect attend

7. Name of informal training	Purpose	Date Beg.-of day	Time End-of day	No. days expect attend

APPENDIX E

IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF AGRICULTURAL AGENTS 1963

REFRESHER AND OTHER TRAINING

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to [a]	Attendance
January 14, 1963 (1 day)	Finger Lakes County Agents' Meeting	Extension organization and orientation	21
January 16, 17, 18, 23, 1963 (1 day) (4 meetings)	Regional Builder's Schools	Farm structures	17[b]
January 21, 1963 (1 day)	Western New York Agents' Meeting	Extension organization and orientation	10
January 21, 1963 (1 day)	Southern Tier Agents' Meeting	Regional meetings	15
January 31, 1963 (1 day)	Southeastern District County Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Extension program development	14
February 11, 1963 (1 day)	Finger Lakes Agents' Meeting	Educational processes	19
February 18, 1963 (1 day)	Southeastern District County Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Rural sociology	15

[a] Subject-matter areas were initially based on assignment areas. These were later added to in order to break important subject-matter areas out of a miscellaneous category.

[b] This total number was divided among the 4 meetings as follows: 5,2,7, and 3.

REFRESHER AND OTHER TRAINING

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to ...	Attendance
February 18, 1963 (1 day)	Southern Tier Agents' Meeting	Extension organization and orientation	20
February 18, 1963 (1 day)	Western New York County Agents' Meeting	Dairy	16
February 25, 1963 (1 day)	North Central Group of County Agricultural Agents	Educational processes	20
February 25-28, 1963 (3 days)	Cornell Turfgrass Conference and School	Home grounds Commercial florists	10
February 26, 27, 1963 (1 1/2 days)	Third Annual Cornell Potato School	Vegetables and potatoes	7
March 11, 1963 (1 day)	Finger Lakes Agents' Meeting	Extension administration and supervision	21
March 12,14,15,18, 19, 1963 (1 day) (5 meetings)	Regional Performance Appraisal Meetings	Extension administration and supervision	44[c]
March 13,14,19,20, 1963 (1 day) (4 meetings)	Regional Milk Marketing Meetings	Dairy	60[d]
March 18, 1963 (1 day)	Western New York Agents' Meeting	Resource development	20

[c] This total number was divided among the 5 meetings as follows: 7, 7, 8, 13, and 9.

[d] This total number was divided among the 4 meetings as follows: 25, 8, 16, and 11.

REFRESHER AND OTHER TRAINING

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
March 18, 1963 (1 day)	North Central Group of County Agricultural Agents	Regional meetings	25
March 18, 1963 (1 day)	Southeastern Agents' Meeting	Vegetables and potatoes	15
March 26,27, and April 2,3, 1963 (1 1/2 days) (2 meetings)	Egg Handling School for Agents	Poultry	10[e]
March 26,28, 1963 (2 1/2 days)	Conference for 56 County Agricultural Agents	Extension program development	55
April 1, 1963 (1 day)	Capitol District Agents' Meeting	Farm forage crops	17
April 15, 1963 (1 day)	Western New York County Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Marketing	16
April 15, 1963 (1 day)	Southern Tier Agents' Meeting	Resource development	19
April 15, 1963 (1 day)	Southeastern District County Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Regional meetings	10
April 18, 1963 (1 day)	Roadside Marketing Workshop	Marketing	22

e This total number was divided among the meetings as follows: 5 and 5.

REFRESHER AND OTHER TRAINING

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
April 24,25, and May 16, 1963 (1 day) (3 meetings)	Regional Vegetable Crops Training Conference	Vegetables and potatoes	22[f]
April 29, 1963 to May 1, 1963 (2 1/2 days)	Agricultural Engineering Training School for County Agents	Farm structures	36
May 9,14,15,16,17, 23, 1963 (1 day) (6 meetings)	Soil Test Meetings	Farm forage crops	67[g]
May 13, 1963 (1 day)	North Central County Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Regional meetings	21
May 14,15,16, 1963 (1 day) (3 meetings)	Regional Training School for Agents	Farm management	45[h]
May 20, 1963 (1 day)	Southern Tier Agents' Meeting	Regional meetings	17
May 20, 1963 (1 day)	Finger Lakes County Agents' Meeting	Extension organization and orientation	16
May 20, 1963 (1 day)	Southeastern District County Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Farm forage crops	16
May 21,22, 1963 (1 1/2 days)	Poultry Agents' Professional Improvement Program	Farm structures	8

[f] This total number was divided among the 3 meetings as follows: 5, 11, and 6.

[g] This total number was divided among the 6 meetings as follows: 12, 8, 17, 6, 10, and 14.

[h] This total number was divided among the 3 meetings as follows: 13, 21, and 11.

REFRESHER AND OTHER TRAINING

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
June 2, 3, 1963 (1 1/2 days)	Southeastern District County Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Resource development	12
June 3, 1963 (1 day)	Capitol District Agents' Group	Communications including Extension news	17
June 4, 5, 1963 (1 day)	Operation Advance School	Public affairs	49
June 10, 1963 (1 day)	Finger Lakes County Agents' Meeting	Communications including Extension news - 1/2 day Regional meetings-1/2 day	16
June 17, 1963 (1/2 day)	Western New York Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Communications including Extension news	19
June 17, 1963 (1 day)	Southern Tier Agents' Meeting	Farm forage crops	20
June 18,19, 1963 (1 1/2 days)	Livestock Training School For County Agricultural Agents	Livestock	11
June 24, 1963 (1 day)	North Central County Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Regional meetings	22
July 10,11, 1963 (1 day)	Poultrymen's Get-together	Poultry	15

REFRESHER AND OTHER TRAINING

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
July 15, 1963 (1 day)	Southern Tier Agents' Meeting	Resource development	13
July 31, 1963 (1 day)	Rural Home Grounds Workshop	Home grounds	3
August 12, 1963 (1 day)	Southeastern District County Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Communications including Extension news	16
August 14, 1963 (1 day)	Northeastern New York Plant Materials Workshop	Home grounds Commercial florists	6
August 26, 1963 (1 day)	North Central County Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Regional Meetings	12
Sept. 6, [illegible], 1963 and Oct. 3, 1963 (1 day) (3 meetings)	Regional Agents' Public Affairs Meeting	Public affairs	40[1]
Sept. 9, 1963 (1 day)	Capitol District Agents' Meeting	Farm management	20
Sept. 16, 1963 (1/2 day)	Western New York Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Regional meetings	16
Sept. 16, 1963 (1 day)	Southeastern District County Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Marketing	10
Sept. 16, 1963 (1 day)	Southern Tier Agents' Meeting	Regional meetings	16

[1] This total number was divided among the 3 meetings as follows: 15, 9, and 16.

REFRESHER AND OTHER TRAINING

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
Sept. 25,26, and Oct. 1,2,3,4, 1963 (2 days) (3 meetings)	County Agents' Conference on Farm Family Business Arrangements	Farm management	76[1]
Sept. 30, 1963 (1 day)	North Central Group County Agricultural Agents	Regional meetings	24
Oct. 7, 1963 (1 day)	Capitol District County Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Regional meetings	19
Oct. 16, 1963 (2 days)	Two County Tour	Home grounds	9
Oct. 21, 1963 (1 day)	Southern Tier Agents' Meeting	Extension housekeeping	18
Oct. 23, 24, 1963 (2 days)	Poultry Business Management Training School	Poultry	13
Oct. 28, 1963 (1 day)	North Central Group County Agricultural Agents'	Regional meetings	23
Oct. 28, 1963 (1/2 day)	Western New York County Agricultural Agents' Meeting	Regional meetings	17
Nov. 7, 1963 (1 day)	Capitol District Agents' Meeting	Extension program development	19
Nov. 11, 1963 (1 day)	Finger Lakes County Agents' Meeting	Regional meetings	15

[1] This total number was divided among the 3 meetings as follows: 23, 24, and 29.

REFRESHER AND OTHER TRAINING

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
Nov. 12-15, 1963 (3 1/2 days)	Agents' Fruit Conference	Fruit	14
Nov. 18, 1963 (1 day)	Southern Tier Agents' Meeting	Extension housekeeping	15
Nov. 21,22, 1963 (1 1/2 days)	Dairy Training School	Dairy	55
Nov. 25,26, 1963 (2 days)	Agents' Livestock Training School	Livestock	11
Nov. 26, 1963 (1 day)	ELFAC Training Session	Farm management	23
Dec. 3-5, 1963 (2 days)	Vegetable Agents' Training School	Vegetables and potatoes	25
Dec. 3,4,9,17, 18, 1963 (1 day) (8 meetings)	Farm Tax School	Farm management	75[k]
Dec. 11,12, 1963 (2 days)	Economic School	Farm management	131

[k] This total number was divided among the 8 meetings as follows: 17, 4, 9, 13, 9, 9, 6, and 8.

IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF AGRICULTURAL AGENTS 1963

INDUCTION TRAINING FOR NEW ASSISTANT COUNTY AGRICULTURAL AGENTS

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to [a]	Attendance
April 1,11,12, 1963 (2 1/2 days)	State Leaders	Extension organization - orientation	10
April 2, 1963 (1/4 day)	Vegetable Crops	Vegetables and potatoes	10
April 2, 1963 (1/4 day)	Extension Teaching and Information	Communications including Extension news	10
April 2, 1963 (1/2 day)	W. K. Kennedy	Extension organization - orientation	10
April 3, 1963 (1/4 day)	Entomology	Fruit Vegetables and potatoes Farm forage crops Commercial florists Home grounds	10
April 3, 1963 (1/4 day)	Plant Breeding	Fruit Vegetables and potatoes Farm forage crops Commercial florists Home grounds	10

[a] Subject-matter areas were initially based on assignment areas. These were later added to in order to break important subject-matter areas out of a miscellaneous category.

INDUCTION TRAINING FOR NEW ASSISTANT COUNTY AGRICULTURAL AGENTS

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
April 3, 1963 (1/2 day)	Animal Husbandry	Dairy Livestock	10
April 4, 1963 (1 day)	Geneva Experimental Station	Extension organization - orientation	10
April 5, 1963 (1/2 day)	Agricultural Engineering	Farm structures	10
April 5, 1963 (1/2 day)	Floriculture and Ornamental Horticulture	Commercial florists Home grounds	10
April 8, 1963 (1/4 day)	Rural Sociology	Rural sociology	10
April 8, 1963 (1/4 day)	Pomology	Fruit	10
April 8, 1963 (1/2 day)	Poultry	Poultry	10
April 9, 1963 (1/2 day)	Agricultural Economics	Farm management	10
April 9, 1963 (1/2 day)	Conservation	Resource development	10
April 10, 1963 (1/4 day)	Extension Studies	Extension organization - orientation	10

INDUCTION TRAINING FOR NEW ASSISTANT COUNTY AGRICULTURAL AGENTS

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
April 10, 1963 (1/4 day)	Plant Pathology	Fruit Vegetables and potatoes Farm forage crops Commercial florists Home grounds	10
April 10, 1963 (1/2 day)	Agronomy	Fruit Vegetables and potatoes Farm forage crops Commercial florists Home grounds	10
Oct. 28, and Nov. 7,8, 1963 (2 1/2 days)	State Leaders	Extension organization - orientation	9
Oct. 29, 1963 (1/4 day)	Vegetable Crops	Vegetables and potatoes	9
Oct. 29, 1963 (1/4 day)	Extension Teaching and Information	Communications including Extension news	9
Oct. 29, 1963 (1/2 day)	J. F. Metz	Extension organization - orientation	9
Oct. 30, 1963 (1/4 day)	Entomology	Fruit Vegetables and potatoes Farm forage crops Commercial florists Home grounds	9

INDUCTION TRAINING FOR NEW ASSISTANT COUNTY AGRICULTURAL AGENTS

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
Oct. 30, 1963 (1/4 day)	Pomology	Fruit	9
Oct. 30, 1963 (1/2 day)	Agronomy	Fruit Vegetables and potatoes Farm forage crops Commercial florists Home grounds	9
Oct. 31, 1963 (1 day)	Geneva Experimental Station	Extension organization - orientation	9
Nov. 1, 1963 (1/2 day)	Agricultural Engineering	Farm structures	9
Nov. 1, 1963 (1/2 day)	Floriculture and Ornamental Horticulture	Commercial florists Home grounds	9
Nov. 4, 1963 (1/4 day)	Rural Sociology	Rural sociology	9
Nov. 4, 1963 (1/4 day)	Plant Breeding	Fruit Vegetables and potatoes Farm forage crops Commercial florists Home grounds	9
Nov. 4, 1963 (1/2 day)	Poultry	Poultry	9

INDUCTION TRAINING FOR NEW ASSISTANT COUNTY AGRICULTURAL AGENTS

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
Nov. 5, 1963 (1/2 day)	Agricultural Economics	Farm management	9
Nov. 6, 1963 (1/2 day)	Conservation	Resource development	9
Nov. 6, 1963 (1/4 day)	Extension Studies	Extension organization - orientation	9
Nov. 6, 1963 (1/4 day)	Plant Pathology	Fruit Vegetables and potatoes Farm forage crops Commercial florists Home grounds	9
Nov. 6, 1963 (1/2 day)	Animal Husbandry	Dairy Livestock	9

IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF AGRICULTURAL AGENTS 1963

EARLY TRAINING SCHOOL OF ASSISTANT AGENTS - 1st YEAR

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to [a]	Attendance
July 8,15, 1963 (2 days)	Agronomy	Farm forage crops Vegetables and potatoes Fruit Resource development Commercial florists Home grounds	13
July 9,16, 1963 (2 days)	Agricultural Economics	Farm management	13
July 10, 17, 1963 (2 days)	Agricultural Engineering	Farm structures	13
July 11, 18, 1963 (2 days)	Rural Sociology Rural Education Extension Teaching and Information	Rural sociology - 1 day Communications including Extension news - 1 day	13
July 12, 1963 (1 day)	Conservation	Resource development	13
July 19,22, 1963 (1 day)	Crop Physiology	Farm forage crops Vegetables and potatoes Fruit Commercial florists Home grounds	13

[a] Subject-matter areas were initially based on assignment areas. These were later added to in order to break important subject-matter areas out of a miscellaneous category.

EARLY TRAINING SCHOOL OF ASSISTANT AGENTS - 1st YEAR

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
July 19, 1963 (1/2 day)	Entomology	Farm forage crops Vegetables and potatoes Fruit Commercial florists Home grounds	13
July 22, 1963 (1 day)	Plant Pathology	Farm forage crops Vegetables and potatoes Fruit Commercial florists Home grounds	13
July 23, 1963 (1 day)	General Livestock	Livestock	9
July 23, 1963 (1 day)	Pomology	Fruit	4
July 24, 1963 (1 day)	Poultry	Poultry	9
July 24, 1963 (1 day)	Floriculture - home owners	Home grounds Commercial florists	4
July 25, 1963 (1 day)	Vegetable Crops	Vegetables and potatoes	4
July 25, 26, 1963 (2 days)	Dairy Husbandry	Dairy	9

EARLY TRAINING SCHOOL OF ASSISTANT AGENTS - 2nd YEAR

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
July 8, 1963 (1 day)	Conservation	Resource development	10
July 9, 1963 (1 day)	Plant Pathology	Farm forage crops Vegetables and potatoes Fruit Commercial florists Home grounds	10
July 10, 17, 1963 (2 days)	Agricultural Economics	Farm management - 1 day Marketing - 1 day	10
July 11, 18, 1963 (2 days)	Agricultural Engineering	Farm structures	10
July 12,19, 1963 (2 days)	Rural Sociology Rural Education Extension Teaching and Information	Communications including Extension news	10
July 15,16, 1963 (1 day)	Crop Physiology	Farm forage crops Vegetables and potatoes Fruit Commercial florists Home grounds	10

EARLY TRAINING SCHOOL OF ASSISTANT AGENTS - 2nd YEAR

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
July 15,16, 1963 (1 day)	Entomology	Livestock - 1/4 day Dairy - 1/4 day Vegetables and potatoes - 1/4 day Commercial florists-1/4 day Home grounds-1/4 day Farm forage crops-1/4 day	10
July 22,26, 1963 (2 days)	Dairy Husbandry	Dairy	8
July 22, 1963 (1 day)	Pomology	Fruit	2
July 22, 1963 (1 day)	Vegetable Crops	Vegetables and potatoes	2
July 23, 1963 (1 day)	Agronomy and Plant Breeding	Farm forage crops	10
July 24, 1963 (1 day)	General Livestock	Livestock	8
July 25, 1963 (1 day)	Poultry	Poultry	8
July 25, 1963 (1 day)	Home Owners Floriculture	Home grounds - 1/2 day Commercial florists - 1/2 day	2

EARLY TRAINING SCHOOL OF ASSISTANT AGENTS - 3rd YEAR

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
July 8,26, 1963 (1 1/2 days)	Agricultural Economics	Farm management	10
July 8,22, 1963 (1 1/2 days)	Rural Sociology	Rural sociology	10
July 9, 1963 (1 day)	Agricultural Engineering	Farm structures	10
July 10,24, 1963 (2 days)	Agronomy	Farm management	10
July 11,25, 1963 (1 day)	Conservation	Resource development	3
July 11, 1963 (1/2 day)	General Livestock	Livestock	7
July 11, 1963 (1/2 day)	Pomology	Fruit	3
July 12,15,16,17, 18,19,22, 1963 (6 1/2 days)	Interdepartmental Farm Study	Farm management	10
July 15,18,19, 25, 1963 (3 days)	Floriculture Home Owners	Commercial florists-2 days Home Grounds - 1 1/2 days	3

-63-

EARLY TRAINING SCHOOL OF ASSISTANT AGENTS - 3rd YEAR

Date and Length	Name of Meeting	Subject-matter Area Applicable to	Attendance
July 16,17, 1963 (2 days)	Entomology and Plant Pathology	Farm forage crops Vegetables and potatoes Fruit Home grounds Commercial florists	3
July 23, 1963 (1 day)	Poultry	Poultry	7
July 25, 1963 (1/2 day)	Dairy Husbandry	Dairy	7
July 26, 1963 (1 day)	Agricultural Economics	Farm management	3

APPENDIX F

Table 1. Relationship of Number of Days of Refresher and Other Training to Days of In-put of Agents by Areas of Responsibility for 168 Agricultural Agents: 1963.

	Days of in-put of agents						
	None	0.1-10.0	10.1-20.0	20.1-40.0	40.1-60.0	60.1+	Total
Commercial florists or horticulture	(N=84)	(N=61)	(N=2)	(N=8)	(N=7)	(N=6)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	84	55	2	5	3	4	153
Total man days of training	-	10.00	-	8.00	10.00	6.00	34.00
Average no. of days for those having training	-	1.67	-	2.67	2.50	3.00	2.27
Dairying	(N=46)	(N=42)	(N=21)	(N=23)	(N=20)	(N=16)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	40	23	10	3	1	-	77
Total man days of training	6.00	24.00	16.00	33.75	41.50	34.25	155.50
Average no. of days for those having training	1.00	1.26	1.45	1.69	2.18	2.14	1.71
Farm forage crops	(N=32)	(N=43)	(N=20)	(N=33)	(N=26)	(N=14)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	20	27	10	10	3	3	73
Total man days of training	14.00	21.00	12.00	26.00	33.00	14.00	120.00
Average no. of days for those having training	1.17	1.31	1.20	1.13	1.43	1.27	1.26
Farm management	(N=27)	(N=51)	(N=32)	(N=28)	(N=13)	(N=17)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	11	8	4	-	-	-	23
Total man days of training	41.00	128.00	104.00	119.00	68.00	103.50	563.50
Average no. of days for those having training	2.56	2.98	3.71	4.25	5.23	6.09	3.89

Table 1. Relationship of Number of Days of Refresher and Other Training to Days of In-put of Agents by Areas of Responsibility for 168 Agricultural Agents; 1963 (cont.).

	Days of in-put of agents						
	None	0.1-10.0	10.1-20.0	20.1-40.0	40.1-60.0	60.1+	Total
Farm structures - dairy and poultry	(N=38)	(N=78)	(N=27)	(N=14)	(N=7)	(N=4)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	37	66	12	1	1	-	117
Total man days of training	1.50	15.00	27.00	23.00	8.50	7.50	82.50
Average no. of days for those having training	1.50	1.25	1.80	1.77	1.42	1.88	1.62
Fruit	(N=79)	(N=64)	(N=8)	(N=3)	(N=4)	(N=10)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	79	63	8	2	2	-	154
Total man days of training	-	3.50	-	3.50	7.00	29.00	43.00
Average no. of days for those having training	-	3.50	-	3.50	3.50	2.90	3.07
Home grounds	(N=55)	(N=80)	(N=11)	(N=8)	(N=5)	(N=9)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	52	74	9	5	2	2	144
Total man days of training	6.00	6.00	4.00	3.00	8.00	24.00	51.00
Average no. of days for those having training	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.67	3.43	2.12
Livestock - beef, sheep, and swine	(N=72)	(N=73)	(N=8)	(N=14)	(N=1)	(N=0)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	71	65	4	7	-	-	147
Total man days of training	2.00	12.00	7.00	14.00	1.50	-	36.50
Average no. of days for those having training	2.00	1.50	1.75	2.00	1.50	-	1.74
Marketing	(N=46)	(N=90)	(N=21)	(N=7)	(N=1)	(N=3)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	39	69	10	5	-	2	125
Total man days of training	7.00	23.00	13.50	2.00	1.00	1.00	47.50
Average no. of days for those having training	1.00	1.10	1.23	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.10

Table 1. Relationship of Number of Days of Refresher and Other Training to Days of In-put of Agents by Areas of Responsibility for 168 Agricultural Agents: 1963 (cont.).

	Days of in-put of agents						
	None	0.1-10.0	10.1-20.0	20.1-40.0	40.1-60.0	60.1+	Total
Poultry	(N=88)	(N=59)	(N=10)	(N=5)	(N=2)	(N=4)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	87	53	3	1	-	-	144
Total man days of training	2.00	14.00	7.00	9.00	4.50	14.00	50.50
Average no. of days for those having training	2.00	2.33	1.00	2.25	2.25	3.50	2.10
Public affairs	(N=63)	(N=66)	(N=18)	(N=18)	(N=3)	(N=0)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	57	49	4	2	-	-	112
Total man days of training	7.00	23.50	20.75	29.50	6.00	-	86.75
Average no. of days for those having training	1.17	1.38	1.48	1.84	2.00	-	1.55
Resource development or conservation	(N=33)	(N=77)	(N=33)	(N=17)	(N=5)	(N=3)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	24	54	21	7	3	2	116
Total man days of training	12.00	22.50	17.00	13.50	3.00	2.00	70.00
Average no. days for those having training	1.33	1.25	1.42	1.35	1.50	2.00	1.35
Vegetables and potatoes	(N=64)	(N=67)	(N=13)	(N=6)	(N=6)	(N=12)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	62	57	2	2	-	-	123
Total man days of training	2.00	19.00	18.50	5.50	20.50	42.50	108.00
Average no. of days for those having training	1.00	1.90	1.68	1.38	3.42	3.54	2.39

APPENDIX F

Table 2. Relationship of Number of Days of Induction and Early Training to Days of In-put of Agents by Areas of Responsibility for 168 Agricultural Agents: 1963.

	Days of in-put of agents						
	None	0.1-10.0	10.1-20.0	20.1-40.0	40.1-60.0	60.1+	Total
Commercial florists or horticulture	(N=84)	(N=61)	(N=2)	(N=8)	(N=7)	(N=6)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	67	50	2	5	4	4	132
Total man days of training	58.25	46.50	-	8.50	12.25	5.75	131.25
Average no. of days for those having training	3.43	4.23	-	2.83	4.08	2.88	3.65
Dairying	(N=46)	(N=42)	(N=21)	(N=23)	(N=20)	(N=16)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	40	33	16	16	16	9	130
Total man days of training	2.75	8.00	7.25	7.25	7.25	17.00	49.50
Average no. of days for those having training	.46	.89	1.45	1.04	1.81	2.43	1.30
Farm forage crops	(N=32)	(N=43)	(N=20)	(N=33)	(N=26)	(N=14)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	24	34	17	26	19	12	132
Total man days of training	23.75	27.00	7.75	25.00	30.75	6.50	120.75
Average no. of days for those having training	2.97	3.00	2.58	3.57	4.39	3.25	3.35
Farm management	(N=27)	(N=51)	(N=32)	(N=28)	(N=13)	(N=17)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	15	41	28	21	12	8	125
Total man days of training	43.00	24.00	3.50	19.00	1.00	58.00	148.50
Average no. of days for those having training	3.58	2.40	.88	2.71	1.00	6.44	3.45

Table 2. Relationship of Number of Days of Induction and Early Training to Days of In-put of Agents by Areas of Responsibility for 168 Agricultural Agents: 1963 (cont.).

	Days of in-put of agents						
	None	0.1-10.0	10.1-20.0	20.1-40.0	40.1-60.0	60.1+	Total
Farm structures - dairy and poultry	(N=38)	(N=78)	(N=27)	(N=14)	(N=7)	(N=4)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	23	65	17	11	6	3	125
Total man days of training	16.50	22.00	18.00	5.00	2.00	2.00	65.50
Average no. of days for those having training	1.10	1.69	1.80	1.67	2.00	2.00	1.52
Fruit	(N=79)	(N=64)	(N=8)	(N=3)	(N=4)	(N=10)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	62	48	7	3	3	9	132
Total man days of training	52.00	56.00	3.00	-	2.50	7.00	120.50
Average no. of days for those having training	3.06	3.50	3.00	-	2.50	7.00	3.35
Home grounds	(N=55)	(N=80)	(N=11)	(N=8)	(N=5)	(N=9)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	42	64	11	6	3	6	132
Total man days of training	53.75	54.50	-	5.25	8.25	8.00	129.75
Average no. days for those having training	4.13	3.41	-	2.62	4.12	2.67	3.60
Livestock - beef, sheep, and swine	(N=72)	(N=73)	(N=8)	(N=14)	(N=1)	(N=0)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	57	57	7	8	1	-	130
Total man days of training	10.00	14.50	1.50	6.50	-	-	32.50
Average no. of days for those having training	.67	.91	1.50	1.08	-	-	.86
Marketing	(N=46)	(N=90)	(N=21)	(N=7)	(N=1)	(N=3)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	41	87	19	7	1	3	158
Total man days of training	5.00	3.00	2.00	-	-	-	10.00
Average no. of days for those having training	1.00	1.00	1.00	-	-	-	1.00

Table 2. Relationship of Number of Days of Induction and Early Training to Days of In-put of Agents by Areas of Responsibility for 168 Agricultural Agents: 1963 (cont.).

	Days of in-put of agents						
	None	0.1-10.0	10.1-20.0	20.1-40.0	40.1-60.0	60.1+	Total
Poultry	(N=88)	(N=59)	(N=10)	(N=5)	(N=2)	(N=4)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	69	47	7	3	2	4	132
Total man days of training	16.00	12.50	3.50	1.50	-	-	33.50
Average no. of days for those having training	.84	1.04	1.17	.75	-	-	.93
Public affairs	(N=63)	(N=66)	(N=18)	(N=18)	(N=3)	(N=0)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	63	66	18	18	3	-	168
Total man days of training	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Average no. of days for those having training	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Resource development or conservation	(N=33)	(N=77)	(N=33)	(N=17)	(N=5)	(N=3)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	27	55	28	15	5	2	132
Total man days of training	7.50	40.50	6.00	6.50	-	1.00	61.50
Average no. of days for those having training	1.25	1.84	1.20	3.25	-	1.00	1.71
Vegetables and potatoes	(N=64)	(N=67)	(N=13)	(N=6)	(N=6)	(N=12)	(N=168)
No. of agents with no days of training	49	50	11	6	5	11	132
Total man days of training	47.50	60.50	3.50	-	4.50	5.50	121.50
Average no. of days for those having training	3.17	3.56	1.75	-	4.50	5.50	3.38

ERIC Clearinghouse
APR 1 1968
on Adult Education